



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,056	09/09/2003	Andreas Blumenthal	13913-083001 / 2002P10217	3806
32864 7590 02/18/2009 FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			EXAMINER DAO, THUY CHAN	
			ART UNIT 2192	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 02/18/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/659,056	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BLUMENTHAL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Thuy Dao	<b>Art Unit</b> 2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-14,16-20 and 24-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-14,16-20 and 24-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on December 15, 2008 has been entered.

2. Claims 1-7, 9-14, 16-20 and 24-31 have been examined.

### **Response to Amendments**

3. In the instant amendment, claims 1-7, 9-13, 25, 27 and 28 have been amended.

### **Claim Objections**

4. Claims 1, 13, 17 and 25 are objected to because of minor informality.

#### **Claim 1:**

In line 16, the phrase is considered to read as - -executing a non-activatable checkpoint of the plurality of checkpoints; and- - as recited in lines 5-7 and 17.

#### **Claims 13, 17 and 25:**

Similar correction is requested for claims 13, 17 and 25.

### **Response to Arguments**

5. Applicants' arguments have been considered.

a) Claim Rejection – 35 USC section 102 (Remarks, pp. 9-12):

#### **Old limitations (Remarks, page 11):**

The examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicants' assertions. SAML explicitly teaches:

*establishing a plurality of checkpoints in a computer program, the computer program having a program structure (e.g., page 8, Figure 1: a plurality of assertions; page 6, Introduction: XML-encoded SAML assertions),*

Art Unit: 2192

*each checkpoint in the plurality of checkpoints including an assertion statement (e.g., pp. 11-13, samples of assertion statements); and*

*assigning each checkpoint in the plurality of checkpoints to a checkpoint group without regard to the program structure of the computer program (e.g., page 10, assign each checkpoint to one of three groups of assertions Authentication, Authorization Decision, and Attribute without regard to the program structure),*

*the assignment of each checkpoint to a checkpoint group being specified in the statement defining the respective checkpoint (e.g., page 18, <Authentication Statement>; page 19, <AuthorizationDecisionStatement>; page 21, <Attribute Statement>).*

**New limitations (Remarks, pp. 11-12):**

Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

**b) Claim Rejection – 35 USC section 103 (Remarks, page 12):**

Claims 2, 4-7, 10-12, 14, 16, 18-20, 24 and 27-31 are also rejected based on virtue of their dependencies on the rejected base claims 1, 13, 17 and 25, respectively.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC §101**

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 1-7, 9-12, 27 and 28 are directed to a computer-readable medium, which may include communication medium (specification, page 11, lines 17-19).

A computer-readable medium computer-readable medium is a tangible physical article or object, some form of matter, which a signal is not. That the other two computer-readable medium classes, machine and composition of matter, require

Art Unit: 2192

physical matter is evidence that a manufacture was also intended to require physical matter. A signal, a form of energy, does not fall within either of the two definitions of manufacture. Thus, a signal does not fall within one of the four statutory classes of Sec. 101 – see MPEP 2106

Under the principles of compact prosecution, claims 1-7, 9-12, 27 and 28 have been examined as the Examiner anticipates the claims will be amended to obviate these 35 USC § 101 issues. For example, - -A computer-readable storage medium....- - as disclosed in the specification, page 10, lines 27-30.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103**

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 3, 9, 11, 13, 17, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SAML (art of record, “Assertions and Protocol for the OASIS Security Assertion Markup Language SAML) in view of US Patent No. 6,701,518 to Dwyer et al. (art made of record, hereafter “Dwyer”).

#### **Claim 1:**

SAML discloses *a computer-readable storage medium encoded with a computer program, comprising instructions that, when executed, operate to cause a computer to perform operations comprising:*

*establishing a plurality of checkpoints in a computer program, the computer program having a program structure (e.g., page 8, Figure 1: a plurality of assertions; page 6, Introduction: XML-encoded SAML assertions),*

*each checkpoint in the plurality of checkpoints including an assertion statement (e.g., pp. 11-13, samples of assertion statements); and*

*assigning each checkpoint in the plurality of checkpoints to a checkpoint group without regard to the program structure of the computer program (e.g., page 10, three groups of assertions Authentication, Authorization Decision, and Attribute without regard to the program structure),*

*the assignment of each checkpoint to a checkpoint group being specified in the statement defining the respective checkpoint (e.g., page 18, <Authentication Statement>; page 19, <AuthorizationDecisionStatement>; page 21, <Attribute Statement>); and*

*associating each checkpoint group with one of a plurality of activation variants that indicates a behavior based on a result of the assertion statement (e.g., pp. 18-20),*

*wherein checkpoint groups associated with an activation variant behave in accordance with the activation variant (e.g., pp. 20-23);*

*executing a non-activatable checkpoint of the plurality of checkpoints (e.g. pp. 7-8, FIG. 1, executing application → application request → executing SAML assertions at Policy Enforcement Point, i.e., non-activatable and always executed).*

*SAML does not explicitly disclose selectively executing at least one checkpoint of the plurality of checkpoints based on an activation status of the checkpoint group.*

However, in an analogous art, Dwyer further discloses *selectively executing at least one checkpoint of the plurality of checkpoints based on an activation status of the checkpoint group* (e.g., col.5: 66 – col.6: 23, turning on/off assertion testing; col.7: 28 – col.8: 25; three modes of turning on/off assertion testing).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Dwyer's teaching into SAML's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to enable selective assertion testing based on run time inputs as suggested by Dwyer (e.g., col.1: 27-65 and col.2: 26-42).

**Claim 3:**

SAML discloses *the computer-readable medium of claim 1, further comprising instructions to: establish activation variants to enable multiple checkpoint groups to be managed jointly* (e.g., pp. 24-27).

**Claim 9:**

SAML discloses *the computer-readable medium of claim 1, wherein each assertion statement when activated testing whether a specified assertion condition is true or false; and the checkpoints comprise breakpoint statements, each breakpoint statement when activated halting program execution when it is encountered during program execution* (e.g., pp. 11-15).

**Claim 11:**

SAML discloses *the computer-readable medium of claim 1, further comprising instructions to establish a development environment for developing the computer program in which the checkpoint groups are development objects* (e.g., pp. 36-40).

**Claim 13:**

SAML discloses *an apparatus, comprising:*

*means for establishing a plurality of checkpoints in a computer program, the computer / program having a program structure* (e.g., page 8, Figure 1: a plurality of assertions; page 6, Introduction: XML-encoded SAML assertions),

*each checkpoint in the plurality of checkpoints including an assertion statement; means for assigning each checkpoint in the plurality of checkpoints to a checkpoint group* e.g., pp. 11-13, samples of assertion statements)

*without regard to the program structure of the computer program* (e.g., page 10, three groups of assertions Authentication, Authorization Decision, and Attribute without regard to the program structure),,

*the assignment of each checkpoint to a checkpoint group being specified in the statement defining the respective checkpoint* (e.g., page 18, <Authentication

Art Unit: 2192

Statement>; page 19, <AuthorizationDecisionStatement>; page 21, <Attribute Statement>;

*means for associating each checkpoint: group with one of a plurality of activation variants that indicate behavior based on a result of the assertion statement (e.g., pp. 18-20):*

*wherein checkpoint groups associated with an activation variant behave in accordance with the activation variant (e.g., pp. 10-16); and*

*means for executing a non-activatable checkpoint of the plurality of checkpoints (e.g. pp. 7-8, FIG. 1, executing application → application request → executing SAML assertions at Policy Enforcement Point, i.e., non-activatable and always executed).*

SAML does not explicitly disclose *selectively executing at least one checkpoint of the plurality of checkpoints based on an activation status of the checkpoint group.*

However, in an analogous art, Dwyer further discloses *selectively executing at least one checkpoint of the plurality of checkpoints based on an activation status of the checkpoint group* (e.g., col.5: 66 – col.6: 23, turning on/off assertion testing; col.7: 28 – col.8: 25; three modes of turning on/off assertion testing).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Dwyer's teaching into SAML's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to enable selective assertion testing based on run time inputs as suggested by Dwyer (e.g., col.1: 27-65 and col.2: 26-42).

**Claim 17:**

SAML discloses *a method, comprising:*

*receiving a computer program having a plurality of checkpoints, each checkpoint being assigned to at least one of a plurality of checkpoint groups (e.g., page 8, Figure 1: a plurality of assertions; page 6, Introduction: XML-encoded SAML assertions),*



*each checkpoint and each checkpoint group being identified by a group identifier, each checkpoint in the plurality of checkpoints including an assertion statement (e.g., pp. 11-13, samples of assertion statements),*

*the assignment of each checkpoint to a checkpoint group being specified in the statement defining the respective checkpoint, the statement including the group identifier identifying the checkpoint group (e.g., page 10, three groups of assertions Authentication, Authorization Decision, and Attribute);*

*associating each checkpoint group with one of a plurality of activation variants that indicates a behavior based on a result of the assertion statement (e.g., page 18, <Authentication Statement>; page 19, <AuthorizationDecisionStatement>; page 21, <Attribute Statement>),*

*wherein checkpoint groups associated with an activation variant behave in accordance with the activation variant; and receiving user input to invoke checkpoints as a group according to their group identifiers (e.g., pp. 18-23); and*

*executing a non-activatable checkpoint of the plurality of checkpoints (e.g. pp. 7-8, FIG. 1, executing application → application request → executing SAML assertions at Policy Enforcement Point, i.e., non-activatable and always executed).*

*SAML does not explicitly disclose selectively executing at least one checkpoint of the plurality of checkpoints based on an activation status of the checkpoint group.*

*However, in an analogous art, Dwyer further discloses selectively executing at least one checkpoint of the plurality of checkpoints based on an activation status of the checkpoint group (e.g., col.5: 66 – col.6: 23, turning on/off assertion testing; col.7: 28 – col.8: 25; three modes of turning on/off assertion testing).*

*It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Dwyer's teaching into SAML's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to enable selective assertion testing based on run time inputs as suggested by Dwyer (e.g., col.1: 27-65 and col.2: 26-42).*

**Claim 25:**

SAML discloses *a method for adding checkpoints to a computer program having source code, the method comprising:*

*adding to the computer program a plurality of checkpoints each assigned to a checkpoint group by a respective group name for the checkpoint (e.g., page 8, Figure 1: a plurality of assertions; page 6, Introduction: XML-encoded SAML assertions; pp. 11-13, samples of assertion statements),*

*each checkpoint in the plurality of checkpoints including an assertion statement (e.g., page 10, three groups of assertions Authentication, Authorization Decision, and Attribute),*

*the assignment of each checkpoint to a checkpoint group being specified in the statement defining the respective checkpoint (e.g., page 18, <Authentication Statement>; page 19, <AuthorizationDecisionStatement>; page 21, <Attribute Statement>);*

*associating each checkpoint group with one of a plurality of activation variants that indicates a behavior based on a result of the assertion statement (e.g., pp. 18-20);*

*wherein checkpoint groups associated with an activation variant behave in accordance with the activation variant (e.g., pp. 20-23); and*

*executing a non-activatable checkpoint of the plurality of checkpoints (e.g. pp. 7-8, FIG. 1, executing application → application request → executing SAML assertions at Policy Enforcement Point, i.e., non-activatable and always executed).*

SAML does not explicitly disclose *selectively executing at least one checkpoint of the plurality of checkpoints based on an activation status of the checkpoint group.*

However, in an analogous art, Dwyer further discloses *selectively executing at least one checkpoint of the plurality of checkpoints based on an activation status of the checkpoint group (e.g., col.5: 66 – col.6: 23, turning on/off assertion testing; col.7: 28 – col.8: 25; three modes of turning on/off assertion testing).*

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Dwyer's teaching into SAML's teaching. One would

Art Unit: 2192

have been motivated to do so to enable selective assertion testing based on run time inputs as suggested by Dwyer (e.g., col.1: 27-65 and col.2: 26-42).

**Claim 26:**

SAML discloses *the method of claim 25, further comprising:*

*adding the plurality of checkpoints to the source code of the computer program, the respective group name for each checkpoint being included in the source code for the checkpoint (e.g., pp. 15-17); and*

*transporting the checkpoint groups as development objects with the computer program from a development environment to a production environment; the development objects being objects created and managed by the development environment (e.g. pp. 7-9).*

10. Claims 2, 4-7, 10-12, 14, 16, 18-20, 24, and 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SAML in view of Dwyer and Bates (art of record, US Patent No. 6,378,125).

**Claim 2:**

Neither SAML nor Dwyer explicitly discloses *the computer-readable medium of claim 1, wherein the checkpoints comprise breakpoint statements.*

However, in an analogous art, Bates further discloses *the checkpoints comprise breakpoint statements (e.g., col.5: 40 – col.6: 36; col.6: 44 – col.7: 37).*

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bates' teaching into SAML and Dwyer's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to debug multi-threaded applications as suggested by Bates (e.g., col.2: 5-41).

**Claim 4:**

Bates further discloses *the computer-readable medium of claim 1, further comprising instructions to: receive a control input activating a first checkpoint group; and*

Art Unit: 2192

*activate the checkpoints in the first checkpoint group (e.g., FIG. 4, block 74 YES/NO, col.5: 40 – col.6: 36).*

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bates' teaching into SAML and Dwyer's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to debug multi-threaded applications as suggested by Bates (e.g., col.2: 5-41).

**Claim 5:**

Bates further discloses *the computer-readable medium of claim 4, wherein the instructions to receive a control input further comprise instructions to:*

*receive a control input that specifies a mode in which checkpoints that are assertions terminate on assertion failure (e.g., col.4: 41 – col.5: 5);*

*receive a control input that specifies a mode in which checkpoints that are assertions log status on assertion failure (e.g., col.5: 26-65); and*

*receive a control input that specifies a mode of activating checkpoints in which assertions break in a debugger on assertion failure (e.g., col.6: 10-43).*

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bates' teaching into SAML and Dwyer's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

**Claim 6:**

Bates further discloses *the computer-readable medium of claim 4, further comprise instructions to: receive a control input specifying that activating is to be performed only for a particular user of multiple users using the computer program, the activating not affecting the use of the computer program by other users (e.g., col.6: 59 – col.7: 37).*

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bates' teaching into SAML and Dwyer's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

Art Unit: 2192

**Claim 7:**

Bates further discloses *the computer-readable medium of claim 4, further comprise instructions to: receive a control input specifying that activating is to be performed only for a particular server of multiple servers on which the computer program is running (e.g., col.8: 44 – col.9: 32).*

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bates' teaching into SAML and Dwyer's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

**Claim 10:**

Bates further discloses *the computer-readable medium of claim 2, wherein: the assertion statements comprise an assertion statement having an argument to activate logging with programmer-controlled granularity, the argument being used to determine whether to update a log entry when the assertion statement fails (e.g., col.7: 10-62).*

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bates' teaching into SAML and Dwyer's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

**Claim 12:**

Bates further discloses *the computer-readable medium of claim 1, wherein the checkpoints and the computer program are in a compiled form (e.g., col.6: 44 – col.7: 37).*

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bates' teaching into SAML and Dwyer's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

**Claim 14:**

Bates further discloses *the apparatus of claim 13, wherein the checkpoints comprise breakpoints (e.g., col.5: 40-65).*

Art Unit: 2192

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bates' teaching into SAML and Dwyer's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

**Claim 16:**

Bates further discloses *the apparatus of claim 13, further comprising: means, for associating an activation variant with a compilation unit* (e.g., col.5: 26 – col.6: 36).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bates' teaching into SAML and Dwyer's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

**Claim 18:**

Bates further discloses *the method of claim 17, further comprising: receiving a user input specifying a mode of invocation of checkpoints; and invoking checkpoints according to the specified mode* (e.g., col.6: 37 – col.7: 22).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bates' teaching into SAML and Dwyer's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

**Claim 19:**

Bates further discloses *the method of claim 17, further comprising:*  
*receiving a further user input specifying a scope of invocation of checkpoints* (e.g., col.5: 26-65),  
*the scope specifying that checkpoints are to be invoked only for a particular user of multiple users using the computer program* (e.g., col.6: 37 – col.7: 22);  
*and*  
*invoking checkpoints according to the specified scope* (e.g., col.7: 38 – col.8: 29).

Art Unit: 2192

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bates' teaching into SAML and Dwyer's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

**Claim 20:**

Bates further discloses *the method of claim 17, further comprising:*

*receiving a further User input specifying a scope of invocation of checkpoints, the scope specifying that checkpoints are to be invoked only for a particular server of multiple servers (e.g., col.4: 49 – col.5: 39)*

*on which the computer program is running; and invoking checkpoints according to the specified scope (e.g., col.5: 66 – col.6: 36).*

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bates' teaching into SAML and Dwyer's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

**Claim 24:**

Bates further discloses *the method of claim 17, wherein the computer program has checkpoints including breakpoints (e.g., col.4: 49 – col.5: 25).*

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bates' teaching into SAML and Dwyer's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

**Claim 27:**

Bates further discloses *the computer-readable medium of claim 10, wherein argument to activate logging indicates that a log entry is made for each distinct value of a named field (e.g., col.5: 26-65).*

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bates' teaching into SAML and Dwyer's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

Art Unit: 2192

**Claim 28:**

Bates further discloses *the computer-readable medium of: claim wherein the checkpoints: and the activation variants are established in a maintenance module, and affect operation of a separate debugger module (e.g., col.6: 37 – col.7: 23).*

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bates' teaching into SAML and Dwyer's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

**Claim 29:**

Bates further discloses *the apparatus of claim 13, wherein the means for establishing, the means for assigning, and the means for associating are provided in a maintenance module (e.g., col.9: 5-39), and wherein the checkpoint groups and the activation variants affect operation of a separate debugger module (e.g., col.8: 10-44).*

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bates' teaching into SAML and Dwyer's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

**Claim 30:**

Bates further discloses *the method of 17, wherein the checkpoint groups and the activation variants are established in a maintenance module, and affect operation of a separate debugger module (e.g., col.7: 38 – col.8: 9).*

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bates' teaching into SAML and Dwyer's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

**Claim 31:**

Bates further discloses *the method of 25, wherein the checkpoint groups and the activation variants are established in a maintenance module, and affect operation of a separate debugger module (e.g., col.6: 10-62).*



Art Unit: 2192

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bates' teaching into SAML and Dwyer's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

### **Conclusion**

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Thuy Dao (Twee), whose telephone/fax numbers are (571) 272 8570 and (571) 273 8570, respectively. The examiner can normally be reached on every Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from 6:00AM to 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam, can be reached at (571) 272 3695.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273 8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272 2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Thuy Dao/

Examiner, Art Unit 2192

/Tuan Q. Dam/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2192